



CV WG VIRTUAL MEETING 2012.01.12

Meeting minutes

JOINING UP GOVERNMENTS



CV WG VIRTUAL MEETING 2012.01.12 – Meeting minutes

Venue	Virtual Meeting on Arkadin	Meeting date	12/01/2012
Author	NVH	Meeting time	14:00 – 17:00
Reviewed by	PA, SG	Issue date	13/01/2012
Status		Version	0.01

Attendees	Abbreviation	Organisation
Stijn Goedertier	SG	PwC Belgium
Niels Van Hee	NVH	PwC Belgium
Vassilios Peristeras	VP	EU – DG DIGIT
Phil Archer	PA	SEMIC team
Ignacio Boixo	IB	ES – External Expert
Christophe Guéret	CG	NL – Vrije Universiteit
Martin Herzog	MH	DE –]init[
Anja Hopfstock	AHo	DE – BKG Bund.de
Anne Gro Hustoft	AHu	NO – Agency for Public Management and eGovernment
Michaela Elisa Jackson	MJ	IT – CSI Piemonte - Governo e Gestione
Michael Lutz	ML	EU – INSPIRE
Piotr Madziar	PM	EU – DG Markt
Aine Mitchell	AM	IE – Enterprise Registry Solutions / EBR
Greg Potterton	GP	NL – Eurojust
Sebastian Sklarß	SS	DE –]init[
Raj Singh	RS	US – Open Geospatial Consortium
Chris Taggart	CT	UK – Open Corporates

Attendees	Abbreviation	Organisation
Philippe Vlérick	PV	EU – DG Justice
Neven Vrčec	NV	HR – University of Zagreb
Rob Walker	RW	UK – Independent Consultant

AGENDA:

Common

1. Overview of the combined conceptual schema
2. Presentation of evolving spec

Core Person

1. Roll call and adoption of minutes
2. Issue 98: personal identifiers
3. Issue 131: place of birth
4. Issues 100 and 103: recording of change
5. Issue 101: death related details
6. Issue 102: alternative names
7. Expectations

Core Business

1. Roll call and adoption of minutes
2. Multiplicity of legal identifiers
3. Issue 191: country of origin
4. Issue 192: the Formal Identifier class
5. Issue 127: inclusion of a licence field (not discussed)
6. Issue 123: alternative names (not discussed)
7. Expectations

Core Location

1. Roll call and adoption of minutes
2. Presentation of alternative models
3. Resolution of address components
4. Resolution of all open issues
5. Expectations

1. Common

a. Overview of the combined conceptual schema

b. Presentation of evolving spec

Discussion

- Although there are 3 Task Forces, the work is interrelated. PA has created a combined conceptual schema, bringing together the conceptual models from all Task Forces.
- There are 2 classes that are important to all Core Vocabularies:
 - Event: a class that can be used to record change and to capture events in the lifecycle of an instance of another vocabulary.
 - Formal Identifier: a means of identifying an instance of a vocabulary. This class originated in the Core Business Task Force but can be used as an identifier for a Core Person as well.
- CG asks if the existence of an Event class implies that the other classes are immutable. PA clarifies that the Event class is to be discussed by another Task Force (not definite). No conclusions should be drawn at this moment.
- PA also presents the updated specification document. It used the combined conceptual schema. His intention is to be able to resolve all TBCs in the coming 2 weeks (1 week for Core Person).

Documentation

- [Combined conceptual schema](#)

2. Core Person – Roll call and adoption of minutes

Discussion

- GP welcomes everyone to the conference call.
- Minutes of the previous meeting are adopted, with one change: GPs country designation is updated from BE to NL.

Decisions

- Minutes of the previous meeting are adopted.

Documentation

- [Adjusted meeting minutes](#) (v0.02)

3. Core Person – Issue 98: personal identifiers

Discussion

- GP asks if the Task Force sees any additional requirements for the Formal Identifier class in the combined conceptual schema. No additional requirements are added.

Decisions

- The Core Person Task Force agrees to letting the Core Business Task Force continue on the definition of the Formal Identifier. No specific requirements from the Core Person perspective are given.

Action Items	Responsible	Deadline
Include the Formal Identifier as it is and close issue 98.	PA / GP	19/01

4. Core Person – Issue 131: place of birth

Discussion

- The combined conceptual schema refers to Core Location for place of birth. GP asks the Task Force if they consider this a good solution, in the form of a poll.
- SS points out that the Core Location Task Force should consider historical names of locations. PA will make sure this comment is transferred.

Decisions

- Place of birth is included; the details will be provided through the Core Location Task Force. Issue 131 will be closed.

Action Items	Responsible	Deadline
Ensure the Core Location Task Force considers historical names.	PA	19/01
Include place of birth as it is and close issue 131.	PA / GP	19/01

5. Core Person – Issues 100 and 103: recording of change

Discussion

- GP asks what the Task Forces opinions are regarding change. SS states that care should be given to data protection laws. In some countries, there are legal restrictions on the time range in which data can be stored.
- Overall, the group feels that the Event class is a good addition, as long as the date of the event is available (comment by CG).

- A number of options are discussed: time-stamping an entire class, time-stamping each attribute,... This is considered a very generic property however and the discussion will be left in the hands of specialised Task Force for Event and change. As a result, issues 100 and 103 can be closed.

Action Items	Responsible	Deadline
Close issues 100 and 103.	PA / GP	19/01

6. Core Person – Issue 101: death related details

Discussion

- As a follow up to the previous meeting, PA has looked for use cases making a strong case for in the inclusion of death details. The group has no use case that really requires death related details to be part of the Core Person.
- PA also suggests that the Event class could capture this (as a transition from ‘alive’ to ‘dead’ event). CG points out that this could be the same approach for all birth related matters then. PA understands the reasoning but believes this has a practical implication: organisations usually capture birth as a simple attribute, not as a complex event. This would make it less straight-forward for such organisations to adopt Core Person (he agrees with this theoretical approach however).
- SG believes that death related information is important, if seen as an event. There are a number of registries that capture life events (marriage, ...) that have an important legal or financial implication.
- SS questions the scope of the Event class. Is it only related to current attributes or can it be used to ‘add’ attributes to Core Person that are currently not part of the specification? GP clarifies and says that the scope has not yet been defined (this is left for a future, dedicated Task Force). VP states that a complete catalogue of live events is out of scope and that Event should only be used to record changes about existing attributes.
- CG agrees with VPs view and suggests that ‘Update’ might be a better name than ‘Event’.
- VP believes the death related fields have a place in the Core Person (although he is not in favour of inflating a core concept). Including them strikes a balance with the birth related details. Core Person should be usable for both living and deceased persons in his vision. This implies that place of death would also be included.
- A vote is organised and the majority is in favour of including the death related fields.

Decisions

- Death related details will be part of the Core Person specification.

Action Items	Responsible	Deadline
--------------	-------------	----------

Include place of death and date of death in the specification. Close issue 101.	PA / GP	19/01
---	---------	-------

7. Core Person – Issue 102: alternative names

Discussion

- GP organises a poll on the inclusion of alternative names. There are 4 positive votes; the others abstain from voting.
- GP asks what the reason for abstaining is: is it due to uncertainty (not exactly knowing what the proposal is) or is it because there is no opinion. This is mainly due to no particular feeling against including or excluding the attribute.
- MH states that it is an important attribute include: one should be able to refer to a person using the most common name.

Decisions

- Alternative names are included.

Action Items	Responsible	Deadline
Include alternative names in the specification and close issue 102.	PA / GP	19/01

8. Core Person – Expectations

Discussion

- PA states that the work on Core Person is nearing finalisation. All open issues should be closed by next week so that the specification can be made available for a public review period.
- A final meeting will be organised, 19 January, to agree on the last issues.

9. Core Business – Roll call and adoption of minutes

Discussion

- PM welcomes everyone to the call and asks if anyone objects to adopting the meeting minutes.

Decisions

- The minutes of the previous meeting are adopted.

10. Core Business – Multiplicity of legal identifiers

Discussion

- PA asks what the Task Force's view is on the cardinality for the identifiers. Legal identifiers is 0..1 and other identifiers 0..* at this time.
- CT believes that the legal identifier should be mandatory, requiring a cardinality of 1..1. Without a legal identifier, it is not possible to speak of a legal entity. A combination of a name and a registration authority is not sufficient.
- IB thinks the proposal is good, although one has to consider the importance of correctly identifying and representing the issuing authority. He has one concern with mandating the legal identifier: who decides what organisation is responsible and has the authority to give the legal identifier? What authority defines the judicial state? CT believes this should be determined by the country in which the specification is used. This idea is agreed to by IB.
- Adopting REID is not yet possible according to CT. He feels there are too many open issues (is REID going to be in the public domain? How will it evolve?). AM agrees to his point of view. PA clarifies that if someone already wants to add a REID identification this is already possible by using another identifier (other identifiers are unbounded).

Decisions

- The cardinality of the legal identifier will be changed to 1..1.

Action Items

Responsible

Deadline

Update the model to have a legal identifier with a cardinality of 1..1. The corresponding issue can be closed.

PA

19/01

11. Core Business – Issue 191: country of origin

Discussion

- PM asks if there is a need for a country of origin attribute. IB explains that the formal identifier itself should be linked to a country as the legal identifier is also determined by the country. This leads PA to proposing to include it in the formal identifier itself.
- The question is raised if country of origin is needed in any case as the issuing authority is already known. The group's sentiment is that adding a country of origin would only lead to confusion.
- A poll is organised to settle the issue. The group votes against including a country of origin.

Decisions

- Country of origin will not be part of the Core Business specification.

Action Items	Responsible	Deadline
Remove country of origin and close issue 191.	PA	19/01

12. Core Business – Issue 192: the Formal Identifier class

Discussion

- PA asks if there are any comments to the listed attributed in the Formal Identifier.
- CT believes it to be a good proposal.
- SS asks if there is a reason why GeographicIdentifier still uses Text. This is an error in the current model.

Decisions

- Formal Identifier is maintained as it is.

Action Items	Responsible	Deadline
Remove the reference to Text from GeographicIdentifier.	PA	19/01

13. Core Business – Issue 127: inclusion of a licence field

Discussion

- Not discussed. Postponed until the next meeting.

14. Core Business – Issue 123: alternative names

Discussion

- Not discussed. Postponed until the next meeting.

15. Core Business – Expectations

Discussion

-
- PM asks the group to use the wiki as much as possible to continue discussion on some items. This will make it easier to make progress in the next meeting.
-

16. Core Location – Roll call and adoption of minutes

Discussion

- ML welcomes everyone and asks for adoption of the minutes. No comments are issued.

Decisions

- Minutes of the previous meeting are adopted.
-

17. Core Location

- a. Presentation of alternative models**
- b. Resolution of address components**
- c. Resolution of all open issues**

Discussion

- ML presents the work that has been done in the last week. A number of alternative models have been developed, resulting in a final, more compact model.
 - AHo asks if the model is just as expressive as the previous one. ML confirms this. The new model is just a different approach.
 - AHo questions if there is no need for geometry in an Address. ML explains that there are 3 different ways for a user to refer to a location. If Geometry is needed, the user can use one of the other 2 approaches than Address.
 - PA believes the model is perhaps too compact. Although it is a good model to work together with existing specifications, it is a bit too unstructured in his opinion. Having a separate Geometry class gives increased flexibility.
 - RW shares PA's opinion. He points out that a location should be allowed to have multiple Geometry instances (one with points, one with polygons, ...).
 - RS believes there are pro's and con's to either approach. Having a simple text format (with structure) is widely understood and supported by a lot of systems. Using a newer representation format, such as GML, will require more development by adopting organisations.
 - PA is in favour of using a more structured version (with a separate Geometry class) for the public review period. The feedback will point out how much structure the users expect. ML presents an updated version of the model at the end of the meeting.
 - VP asks for a clarification of some of the concepts: what is a Location? What is a Geometry? ML explains that the Task Force considers a Location a section of
-

the surface of the earth, defined by a Geometry. Address has a 'postal' nature, and is not determined by Geometry. RW further explains that a Location exists in the real world.

- PA states that a Location can be vague, requiring the need for a simple String representation. SS also mentions his view on the importance of historical names.

Decisions

- Update the model with a Geometry class.

Action Items

Responsible

Deadline

Update the model to include a Geometry class.

PA / ML

19/01

18. Core Location – Expectations

Discussion

- No specific items discussed.
-